REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 5-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Eloranta in view of Tsai; and claims 3-4 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Eloranta in view of Tsai, further in view of Helferich. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Eloranta discloses the claimed invention, except for identification detail associated with at least one identification detail **abbreviation** relating to each of the at least one subscriber (Office Action, page 4, second paragraph). In this regard, the Examiner cites to Fig. 2 and col. 3, lns. 61-62 and col. 5, lns. 46-48 of Tsai as disclosing identification detail associated with at least one identification detail abbreviating relating to each of the at least one subscriber. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted in previously filed responses, with respect to databases similar to the one described Tsai, a record stored in the home location register (HLR) or in the visitor location register (VLR) of a mobile switching center (MSC) is not uniquely identifiable due to the omission of the three-digit mobile country code (MCC) and due to the omission of the (according to the European standard) two-digit mobile network code (MNC). Using an abbreviated International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) consisting of 10 digits, as described in Tsai, would lead to the fact that the group of subscribers that may be addressed are located around the world and over different country-specific networks and *could not be monitored* within a controllable area. Using such an abbreviated IMSI would only allow a unique identification of a *single subscriber* in each network but *not* a unique identification of a *group* of subscribers in a certain country or country-specific network.

Tsai discloses an apparatus for filtering a disturbance for an incoming phone call that includes a phone call data bank. The phone call data bank stores at least one phone call data, and the phone call data includes an identification type. A user interface device receives a filtering flag set by the user to the phone call data, having the similar identification type. The filtering module of an incoming phone call compares the phone number of the incoming phone call with the filtering flag of the phone call data band, so as to judge whether or not the phone number of the incoming call needs to be screened. (See, abstract). The Examiner equates the index code

231 to the claimed "abbreviation", and that the identification code is judged to determine whether or not is has a filtering flag. The Examiner has misinterpreted the Tsai reference.

Tsai fails to disclose checking whether an identification detail (e.g. phone number) relating to at least one subscriber is included in at least one identification detail <u>abbreviation</u> which is stored in a list of such identification detail abbreviations. Rather, Tsai checks whether a data field named "identification type 234" comprises a bit referred to as a "filtering flag 235." The index code, which the Examiner refers to as the abbreviation, is <u>not</u> related to the check. That is, the identification type 234 is *not* given by an *abbreviation* of a character sequence that is used for identifying a group of subscribers, but is simply a *generic term* which stands for characterizing features of a certain subscriber group ("client", "friend", etc.). On the other hand, the filtering flag 235 of Tsai can *not* be interpreted as an attribute which denotes an identification detail which is *included* in at least one identification detail abbreviation stored in a list of such identification detail abbreviations. This is because filtering flag 235 is an individual bit which *ranks on the same level* as the identification type and the other attributes listed in the first column of the data base table in Fig. 2. Any hierarchy to which the attributes of the database have to obey, in particular a hierarchy according to which the filtering flag 235 is a sub-attribute of the identification type, does not exist.

Moreover, in Tsai, an activation or deactivation of binary filtering flag 235, which is carried out by assigning a corresponding one of Boolean values 'Yes' or 'No' to the bit variable, has to be done *individually* and *separately* to obtain a desired filter criterion for uniquely selecting specific telecommunication links. By contrast, using wildcards such as in the instant invention provides for that a group of suspicious subscribers (e.g. criminals or terrorists) to be intercepted with official authorization of a part thereof, which may also consist of a plurality of subscribers, can be selected at the same time, which considerably reduces the amount of time needed to stipulate which telecommunication links and subscribers are to intercepted and which not.

Finally, there is no reason why the skilled artisan would have combined the Eloranta and Tsai references. Tsai does not relate to a method or device for collecting information on and monitoring a party in a communication network, but rather to a device and a corresponding method for filtering out undesired incoming calls. Use of a "flag" as in Tsai in the Eloranta

method and device would not result in detecting the occurrence of identification data generated when a party is starting or receiving a communication to decide on monitoring a communication. This is because Eloranta compares the actual identification information with the data stored in the database.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing. The Examiner is requested to refer to Attorney Docket No. 118744-42 when responding to this correspondence.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY

Kevin R. Spivak
Reg. No. 43,148
Customer No. 29177

Dated: September 29, 2008